The Examiner's Action dated December 8, 2006, has been received, and its contents carefully noted. In addition, appreciation is expressed to Examiner Nordmeyer for her courtesy and constructive assistance during the personal interview held with undersigned counsel on May 23, 2007.

SUMMARY OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

During the personal interview held on May 23, 2007, the contribution of the present invention and the disclosures of the presently applied references were discussed in detail. It was pointed out, in particular, that the present invention is directed to a section made of a thermoplastics material, the section having a substantially flat wall, or portion, that is provided with a longitudinal succession of mechanically weakened areas, each weakened area being a precursor for a hole having a closed periphery. It was further pointed that each of the pending claims defines specific configurations for these precursors. Applicant's representative presented two basic arguments:

> neither of the applied references discloses any of the specific precursor configurations specifically defined in the claims:
>
> particularly with respect to independent claims 39 and 47, neither of the applied references discloses the provisions of hole precursors, or even holes, in the substantially flat wall of a section having a U-shape, the section further having two flanges each extending transversely to the wall and each joined to a respective longitudinal edge of the wall, so that the wall constitutes, in effect, the base of the U.

In view of the arguments and explanations presented during the interview, it was agreed that if claims 39 and 47 were amended to specify that the wall has a substantially flat shape and that the precursors are formed in that wall, those claims would appear to overcome the present prior art rejection.

The Examiner further agreed that if our response to the last Office Action is in a form of a RCE, with a submission, the next Action in this case, if not an allowance, will not be made final.

***

In view of the points discussed during the personal interview, each of independent claims 39 and 47 has been amended, as agreed during the interview, to specify that the section having a U-shape comprises a substantially flat wall, which wall, as originally defined, extends between two flanges, and to further specify that it is the wall that contains the hole precursors.

In addition, claim 47 has been amended to specify that when the precursor has the form of a through-hole surrounded by a continuous annular web that has a thickness that is less than that of the wall.

The recitation that the precursor may be a through-hole surrounded by continuous annular web having a thickness that is less than that of the flat part is supported by the disclosure in the present specification at page 1, lines 27-31, page 4, line 33 to page 5, line 11, page 6, lines 26-34, and page 13, lines 3-11.

With regard to independent claim 49, with respect to which an agreement was not reached, that claim has now been amended to specify that the thermoplastics material section has a substantially flat part containing hole precursors and that one of the defined precursor forms, which is constituted by a through-hole surrounded by continuous annular web, is constructed so that the web has a thickness that is less than that of the flat part of the section.

As was pointed out during the interview, the primary reference, Deimen, discloses a cable distribution system that includes an element 20, identified as an attachable modesty panel, having a form that can be considered to be, or to at least approximate, a U-shape, together with a raceway 10 with which modesty panel 20 may be used. However, in this structure, the only openings are provided by knockout panels 120 in raceway 10. The reference discloses that these knockout panels can be removed, but the manner in which they are configured to permit removal is not disclosed.

Perhaps more significantly, knockout panels 120 are provided only in raceway 10 and not in any part of the U-shaped modesty panel 20.

Thus, this reference cannot be properly considered to disclose a U-shaped section having any holes, or hole precursors, in a wall that constitutes, in effect, the base of the U. Moreover, the bottom of the modesty panel 20 of the reference is not substantially flat.

As was further pointed during the interview, the Giles patent contains no disclosure whatsoever of any hole precursors. Column 2, lines 33-43 of Giles simply state that the web of the I-shape strips "may be cut-out or perforated to

form seats for electrical outlets and/or… for receiving sleeves for supporting and protecting nut-and-bolt-type levelers". It is submitted that this does not constitute a disclosure of any type of precursor. If the web is cut-out or perforated, the result would be a finished opening for the intended purpose. In any event, this reference also fails to disclose any of the specific precursor forms to which the claims are limited.

With regard to claim 49, which does not specify that the section is U-shaped, this claim should also be considered to distinguish patentably over the applied references because it defines a number of different precursor configurations that are not disclosed in or suggested by either reference.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that all of the claims remaining in the Application now clearly distinguish patentably over the applied references and it is therefore requested that the prior art rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn, that the pending claims be allowed and that the Application be found in allowable condition.

If the above amendment should not now place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call undersigned counsel to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By /jmf/
Jay M. Finkelstein
Registration No. 21,082

JMF:smb
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\B\Bonn\claisse2\pto\2007-06-04-AMD.doc